UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,249	06/18/2001	Lainye Reich	10017175-1	3832

7590 02/24/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
HONEYCUTT, KRISTINA B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/884,249	REICH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kristina B. Honeycutt	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 December 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *10 December 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on December 10, 2004.

This action is made Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 8, 13 and 18 are independent claims

Drawings

3. The objection to the drawings because the specification refers to rendering application labeled as 173a and the drawings show the rendering application labeled as 173b in figure 3 has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

4. The objection to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include reference character 263 mentioned in the description has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 8, 13, and 18 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "System and Method for Distributed Processing, March 6, 2001," herein referred to as Jia, and Selvin et al. (U.S. Patent 6718329).

Regarding independent claim 1, Jia discloses selecting a "rendering application" from a number of "rendering applications" (p.15, lines 27-29) to "render" the document into an "output file embodied in a predefined file" format (p.8, lines 27-30; p.10, lines 11-15; p.11, lines 10-13).

Jia further discloses "automatically rendering the digital document" into the "output file embodied in the predefined file format" with the "select rendering application" (p.8, lines 27-32; p.16, lines 1-6).

Jia does not teach identifying an application employed to generate a digital document in a computer system. Selvin discloses identifying an application "employed" to generate a "digital" document (col. 9, lines 29-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia and Selvin before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering method taught by Jia (p.11, lines 14-32; p.12, lines 1-5) to include identifying the application employed to generate a digital document as taught by Selvin, because identifying the application used to generate the document further identifies the format properties of the document which can be used to

segment the document into paragraphs, headings and other format properties, as taught by Selvin (col. 9, lines 29-36). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because segmenting the document using original formatting properties would render the document to look similar to its original rendering.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Jia discloses the step of receiving the "digital document" from a client device along with a "rendering" request (p.8, lines 19-26).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Jia discloses the step of transmitting the "digital document rendered in the output file embodied in the predefined file format" to a client device (p.9, lines 1-9).

Regarding independent claim 8, Jia discloses code that identifies a select "rendering application" from a number of "rendering applications" (p.15, lines 27-29) to "render" the document into an "output file embodied in a predefined file" format (p.8, lines 27-30; p.10, lines 11-15; p.11, lines 10-13; p.16, lines 25-28).

Jia further discloses code that "automatically rendering the digital document" into the "output file embodied in the predefined file format" with the "select rendering application" (p.8, lines 27-32; p.16, lines 1-6, 25-28).

Jia does not teach code that identifies an application employed to generate a digital document in a computer system. Selvin discloses code for identifying an

application "employed" to generate a "digital" document (col. 9, lines 29-36; p.16, lines 25-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia and Selvin before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering method taught by Jia (p.11, lines 14-32; p.12, lines 1-5) to include identifying the application employed to generate a digital document as taught by Selvin, because identifying the application used to generate the document further identifies the format properties of the document which can be used to segment the document into paragraphs, headings and other format properties, as taught by Selvin (col. 9, lines 29-36). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because segmenting the document using original formatting properties would render the document to look similar to its original rendering.

Regarding independent claim 13, Jia discloses a processor circuit having a processor and a memory (p.6, lines 3-4).

Jia further discloses a "rendering service" executable by the processor and stored in the memory (p.6, lines 6-11; p.11, lines 10-13).

Jia further discloses the rendering service comprising logic that identifies a select "rendering application" from a number of "rendering applications" (p.15, lines 27-29) to "render" the document into an "output file embodied in a predefined file" format (p.8, lines 27-30; p.10, lines 11-15; p.11, lines 10-13; p.16, lines 25-28).

Jia further discloses the rendering service comprising logic that "automatically executes the select rendering application to render the digital document" into the "output

file embodied in the predefined file format" with the "select rendering application" (p.8, lines 27-32; p.16, lines 1-6, 25-28).

Jia does not disclose the "rendering service" comprising logic that identifies an application employed to generate a digital document in a computer system. Selvin discloses logic that identifies an application employed to generate a digital document since Selvin teaches identifying an application "employed" to generate a "digital" document (col. 9, lines 29-36) and logic must be present in order for the application to be identified. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia and Selvin before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32) to include logic that identifies the application employed to generate a digital document as taught by Selvin, because identifying the application used to generate the document further identifies the format properties of the document which can be used to segment the document into paragraphs, headings and other format properties, as taught by Selvin (col. 9, lines 29-36). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because segmenting the document using original formatting properties would render the document to look similar to its original rendering.

Regarding independent claim 18, Jia discloses means for identifying a select "rendering application" from a number of "rendering applications" (p.15, lines 27-29) in a computer system to "render" the document into an "output file embodied in a predefined file" format (p.8, lines 27-30; p.10, lines 11-15; p.11, lines 10-13; p.16, lines 25-28).

Jia further discloses means for "automatically executing the select rendering application to render the digital document" into the "output file embodied in the predefined file format" (p.8, lines 27-32; p.16, lines 1-6, 25-28).

Jia does not teach means for identifying an application employed to generate a digital document in a computer system. Selvin discloses means for identifying an application "employed" to generate a "digital" document (col. 9, lines 29-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia and Selvin before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32) to include means for identifying the application employed to generate a digital document as taught by Selvin, because identifying the application used to generate the document further identifies the format properties of the document which can be used to segment the document into paragraphs, headings and other format properties, as taught by Selvin (col. 9, lines 29-36). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because segmenting the document using original formatting properties would render the document to look similar to its original rendering.

6. Claims 4, 9, 14 and 19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "System and Method for Distributed Processing, March 6, 2001," herein referred to as Jia, Selvin et al. (U.S. Patent 6718329) and Rudy et al. (U.S. Patent 6360252).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Jia does not teach rendering the digital document into a printer compatible output file embodied in a language native to a predefined printer. Rudy discloses rendering the "digital document" into a printer "compatible" output "file embodied in a language native to a predefined" printer (col. 3, lines 61-66; col. 22, lines 45-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia and Rudy before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering method taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32) to include rendering the digital document into a printer compatible output file embodied in a language native to a predefined printer as taught by Rudy, because Jia teaches specifying output information for printing (p.10,lines 17-21) and rendering the document into a printer compatible output file would expand the usage of the rendering method and provide a hard copy of the rendered document to the user. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because users could print copies of the rendered document for future use if the computer was not available for them to use at later times.

Regarding dependent claim 9, Jia does not teach code that automatically executes the select rendering application to render the digital document into the output file embodied in a language native to a predefined printer. Rudy discloses "code" that "automatically" executes the "select rendering application" to render the "digital document" into the output "file embodied in a language native to a predefined" printer (col. 3, lines 61-66; col. 4, lines 18-22; col. 22, lines 45-64). It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia and Rudy before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system with code automatically rendering documents taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.16, lines 1-6) to include code that automatically executes the select rendering application to render the digital document into the output file embodied in a language native to a predefined printer as taught by Rudy, because Jia teaches specifying output information for printing (p.10,lines 17-21) and rendering the document into a printer compatible output file would expand the usage of the rendering method and provide a hard copy of the rendered document to the user. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because users could print copies of the rendered document for future use if the computer was not available for them to use at later times.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Jia does not teach logic that automatically executes the select rendering application to render the digital document into the output file embodied in a language native to a predefined printer. Rudy discloses "logic" that "automatically" executes the "select rendering application" to render the "digital document" into the output "file embodied in a language native to a predefined" printer (col. 3, lines 61-66; col. 4, lines 18-22; col. 22, lines 45-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia and Rudy before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system with logic automatically rendering documents taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.16, lines 1-6, 25-28) to include logic that automatically executes the select rendering application to render the digital

document into the output file embodied in a language native to a predefined printer as taught by Rudy, because Jia teaches specifying output information for printing (p.10,lines 17-21) and rendering the document into a printer compatible output file would expand the usage of the rendering method and provide a hard copy of the rendered document to the user. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because users could print copies of the rendered document for future use if the computer was not available for them to use at later times.

Regarding dependent claim 19, Jia does not teach means for automatically executing the select rendering application to render the digital document into the output file embodied in a language native to a predefined printer. Rudy discloses "means for automatically" executing the "select rendering application" to render the "digital document" into the output "file embodied in a language native to a predefined" printer (col. 3, lines 61-66; col. 4, lines 18-22; col. 22, lines 45-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia and Rudy before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system with means for automatically rendering documents taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.16, lines 1-6, 25-28) to include means for automatically executing the select rendering application to render the digital document into the output file embodied in a language native to a predefined printer as taught by Rudy, because Jia teaches specifying output information for printing (p.10,lines 17-21) and rendering the document into a printer compatible output file would expand the usage of the rendering method and provide a hard copy of

the rendered document to the user. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because users could print copies of the rendered document for future use if the computer was not available for them to use at later times.

7. Claims 5, 10, 15 and 20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "System and Method for Distributed Processing, March 6, 2001," herein referred to as Jia, Selvin et al. (U.S. Patent 6718329), Stone et al. (U.S. Patent 6101510) and Wenocur et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20030041110).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Jia does not teach setting a global print setting associated with the select rendering application to print to the output file. Wenocur discloses setting a global "setting" (p.66, para. 907). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia and Wenocur before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system printing to an output file taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.10, lines 17-21) to include setting a global setting as taught by Wenocur, because Wenocur teaches global "settings" are more efficient in terms of code size and execution speed (p.65, para. 896). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because setting a global print setting would allow for faster printing since the code for printing would be executed quicker.

Jia does not teach generating an instance of the select rendering application to automatically render the digital document into the output file. Stone discloses "generating" an instance of an "application" and "automatically" rendering the "digital document" (col. 3, lines 29-31; col. 8, lines 28-30; col. 23, lines 47-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia and Stone before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system selecting a rendering application to render the document taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.15, lines 27-29; p.16, lines 1-6) to include generating an instance of an application to render the document as taught by Stone, because Stone teaches an application creating and controlling multiple instances (col. 8, lines 30-32). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because generating instances of the rendering application would allow the user to render multiple documents simultaneously which would be more efficient to users rendering more than one document.

Jia does not teach commanding the instance of the select rendering application to perform a print operation on the digital document. Stone discloses "commanding" the instance to "perform" services (col. 8, lines 28-30, 53-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia and Stone before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system performing a print operation taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.10, lines 17-21) to include commanding an instance to perform services as taught by Stone, because Stone teaches instances performing services and an application creating and controlling multiple instances (col. 8, lines 30-32) and Jia teaches printing services. It would have been advantageous to

one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because commanding the instance to print would allow the user to print documents in multiple instances without opening new applications for each since each instance generates its own events, as taught by Stone (col. 8, lines 38-39).

Regarding dependent claim 10, Jia does not teach code that sets a global print setting associated with the select rendering application to print to the output file. Wenocur discloses code for setting a global setting since Wenocur teaches setting a global "setting" (p.66, para. 907) and code must be present in order for the global setting to be set. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia and Wenocur before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system printing to an output file taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.10, lines 17-21; p.16, lines 25-29) to include code setting a global setting as taught by Wenocur, because Wenocur teaches global "settings" are more efficient in terms of code size and execution speed (p.65, para. 896). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because setting a global print setting would allow for faster printing since the code for printing would be executed quicker.

Jia does not teach code that generates an instance of the select rendering application. Stone discloses code that generates an instance of the select rendering application since Stone teaches "generating" an instance of an "application" for rendering (col. 3, lines 29-31; col. 23, lines 47-58) and code must be present in order for the instance to be generated. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art, having the teachings of Jia and Stone before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system code for selecting a rendering application taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.15, lines 27-29; p.16, lines 25-29) to include code for generating an instance of an application as taught by Stone, because Stone teaches an application creating and controlling multiple instances (col. 8, lines 30-32). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because generating instances of the rendering application would allow the user to render multiple documents simultaneously which would be more efficient to users rendering more than one document.

Jia does not teach code that applies a command to the instance of the select rendering application to perform a print operation on the digital document. Stone discloses code for commanding the instance to perform a print operation since Stone teaches "commanding" the instance to "perform" services (col. 8, lines 28-30, 53-55) and code must be present in order to commanding the instances. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia and Stone before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system code performing a print operation taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.10, lines 17-21; p.16, lines 25-29) to include code for commanding an instance to perform services as taught by Stone, because Stone teaches instances performing services and an application creating and controlling multiple instances (col. 8, lines 30-32) and Jia teaches printing services. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because commanding the instance to print would allow the user to print

documents in multiple instances without opening new applications for each since each instance generates its own events, as taught by Stone (col. 8, lines 38-39).

Regarding dependent claim 15, Jia does not teach logic that sets a global print setting associated with the select rendering application to print to the output file. Wenocur discloses logic for setting a global setting since Wenocur teaches setting a global "setting" (p.66, para. 907) and logic must be present in order for the global setting to be set. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia and Wenocur before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system printing to an output file taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.10, lines 17-21; p.16, lines 25-29) to include logic setting a global setting as taught by Wenocur, because Wenocur teaches global "settings" are more efficient in terms of code size and execution speed (p.65, para. 896). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because setting a global print setting would allow for faster printing since the code for printing would be executed quicker.

Jia does not teach logic that generates an instance of the select rendering application. Stone discloses logic that generates an instance of the select rendering application since Stone teaches "generating" an instance of an "application" for rendering (col. 3, lines 29-31; col. 23, lines 47-58) and logic must be present in order for the instance to be generated. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia and Stone before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system logic for selecting a rendering application taught

by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.15, lines 27-29; p.16, lines 25-29) to include logic for generating an instance of an application as taught by Stone, because Stone teaches an application creating and controlling multiple instances (col. 8, lines 30-32). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because generating instances of the rendering application would allow the user to render multiple documents simultaneously which would be more efficient to users rendering more than one document.

Jia does not teach logic that applies a command to the instance of the select rendering application to perform a print operation on the digital document. Stone discloses logic for commanding the instance to perform a print operation since Stone teaches "commanding" the instance to "perform" services (col. 8, lines 28-30, 53-55) and logic must be present in order to commanding the instances. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia and Stone before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system logic performing a print operation taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.10, lines 17-21; p.16, lines 25-29) to include logic for commanding an instance to perform services as taught by Stone, because Stone teaches instances performing services and an application creating and controlling multiple instances (col. 8, lines 30-32) and Jia teaches printing services. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because commanding the instance to print would allow the user to print documents in multiple instances without opening new applications for each since each instance generates its own events, as taught by Stone (col. 8, lines 38-39).

Regarding dependent claim 20, Jia does not teach means for setting a global print setting associated with the select rendering application to print to the output file. Wenocur discloses setting a global "setting" (p.66, para. 907). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia and Wenocur before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system printing to an output file taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.10, lines 17-21) to include setting a global setting as taught by Wenocur, because Wenocur teaches global "settings" are more efficient in terms of code size and execution speed (p.65, para. 896). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because setting a global print setting would allow for faster printing since the code for printing would be executed quicker.

Jia does not teach means for generating an instance of the select rendering application. Stone discloses "generating" an instance of an "application" for rendering (col. 3, lines 29-31; col. 23, lines 47-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia and Stone before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system selecting a rendering application taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.15, lines 27-29) to include generating an instance of an application to render the document as taught by Stone, because Stone teaches an application creating and controlling multiple instances (col. 8, lines 30-32). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because generating instances of the rendering application would allow the user to render multiple

documents simultaneously which would be more efficient to users rendering more than one document.

Jia does not teach means for applying a command the instance of the select rendering application to perform a print operation on the digital document. Stone discloses "commanding" the instance to "perform" services (col. 8, lines 28-30, 53-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia and Stone before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system performing a print operation taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.10, lines 17-21) to include commanding an instance to perform services as taught by Stone, because Stone teaches instances performing services and an application creating and controlling multiple instances (col. 8, lines 30-32) and Jia teaches printing services. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because commanding the instance to print would allow the user to print documents in multiple instances without opening new applications for each since each instance generates its own events, as taught by Stone (col. 8, lines 38-39).

8. Claims 6, 11 and 16 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "System and Method for Distributed Processing, March 6, 2001," herein referred to as Jia, Selvin et al. (U.S. Patent 6718329), Stone et al. (U.S. Patent 6101510), Wenocur et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20030041110) and Poledna (U.S. Patent 5974346).

Regarding dependent claim 6, neither Jia nor Wenocur teach rewriting a global print setting associated with a number of instances of the select rendering application for printing to the output file. Poledna discloses rewriting a global "setting" (col. 5, lines 27-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia, Wenocur and Poledna before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system printing to an output file taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.10, lines 17-21) and global settings taught by Wenocur (p.66, para. 907) to include rewriting a global setting as taught by Poledna, because using global "settings" are more efficient in terms of code size and execution speed, as taught by Wenocur (p.65, para. 896). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because using global print settings would allow for faster printing and quicker execution.

Regarding dependent claim 11, neither Jia nor Wenocur teach code that rewrites a global print setting associated with a number of instances of the select rendering application for printing to the output file. Poledna discloses code for rewriting a global setting since Poledna teaches rewriting a global "setting" (col. 5, lines 27-30) and code must be present in order for a global setting to be rewritten. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia, Wenocur and Poledna before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system code printing to an output file taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.10, lines 17-21; p.16, lines 25-29) and global settings taught by Wenocur (p.66, para. 907) to include code for rewriting a global setting as taught by Poledna, because using global "settings" are more efficient

in terms of code size and execution speed, as taught by Wenocur (p.65, para. 896). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because using global print settings would allow for faster printing and quicker execution.

Regarding dependent claim 16, neither Jia nor Wenocur teach logic that rewrites a global print setting associated with a number of instances of the select rendering application for printing to the output file. Poledna discloses logic for rewriting a global setting since Poledna teaches rewriting a global "setting" (col. 5, lines 27-30) and logic must be present in order for a global setting to be rewritten. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia, Wenocur and Poledna before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system logic printing to an output file taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.10, lines 17-21; p.16, lines 25-29) and global settings taught by Wenocur (p.66, para. 907) to include logic for rewriting a global setting as taught by Poledna, because using global "settings" are more efficient in terms of code size and execution speed, as taught by Wenocur (p.65, para. 896). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because using global print settings would allow for faster printing and quicker execution.

9. Claims 7, 12 and 17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "System and Method for Distributed Processing, March 6, 2001," herein referred to as Jia, Selvin et al. (U.S. Patent 6718329), Stone et al. (U.S. Patent

6101510), Wenocur et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20030041110), Poledna (U.S. Patent 5974346) and Heeschen et al. (U.S. Patent 6380935).

Regarding dependent claim 7, neither Jia nor Wenocur teach synchronizing an initiation of the print operation of the instance of the select rendering application with a number of other initiations of print operations for other instances of the select rendering application. Heeschen discloses synchronizing "initiations of operations of the instances" of rendering "applications" (col. 7, lines 2-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia, Wenocur and Heeschen before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the select rendering application printing the rendered document taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.10, lines 17-21; p.15, lines 27-29) and global settings taught by Wenocur (p.66, para. 907) to include synchronizing initiations of operations of the instances of rendering applications as taught by Heeschen, because using global "settings" are more efficient in terms of code size and execution speed, as taught by Wenocur (p.65, para. 896) and rendered commands can be retrieved in the order received, as taught by Heeschen (col. 7, lines 2-9). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because documents would be printed in the order they were rendered and using global print settings would allow for faster printing and quicker execution.

Regarding dependent claim 12, neither Jia nor Wenocur teach code that synchronizes an initiation of the print operation of the instance of the select rendering application with

a number of other initiations of print operations for other instances of the select rendering application. Heeschen discloses code for synchronizing initiations of operations of instances of rendering applications since Heeschen teaches synchronizing "initiations of operations of the instances" of rendering "applications" (col. 7, lines 2-9) and code must be present in order for synchronization to occur. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia, Wenocur and Heeschen before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the code for the select rendering application to print the rendered document taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.10, lines 17-21; p.15, lines 27-29; p.16, lines 25-29) and global settings taught by Wenocur (p.66, para. 907) to include code for synchronizing initiations of operations of the instances of rendering applications as taught by Heeschen, because using global "settings" are more efficient in terms of code size and execution speed, as taught by Wenocur (p.65, para. 896) and rendered commands can be retrieved in the order received, as taught by Heeschen (col. 7, lines 2-9). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because documents would be printed in the order they were rendered and using global print settings would allow for faster printing and quicker execution.

Regarding dependent claim 17, neither Jia nor Wenocur teach logic that synchronizes an initiation of the print operation of the instance of the select rendering application with a number of other initiations of print operations for other instances of the select rendering application. Heeschen discloses logic for synchronizing initiations of

operations of instances of rendering applications since Heeschen teaches synchronizing "initiations of operations of the instances" of rendering "applications" (col. 7, lines 2-9) and logic must be present in order for synchronization to occur. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Jia, Wenocur and Heeschen before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the logic for the select rendering application to print the rendered document taught by Jia (p.8, lines 14-32; p.10, lines 17-21; p.15, lines 27-29; p.16, lines 25-29) and global settings taught by Wenocur (p.66, para. 907) to include logic for synchronizing initiations of operations of the instances of rendering applications as taught by Heeschen, because using global "settings" are more efficient in terms of code size and execution speed, as taught by Wenocur (p.65, para. 896) and rendered commands can be retrieved in the order received, as taught by Heeschen (col. 7, lines 2-9). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because documents would be printed in the order they were rendered and using global print settings would allow for faster printing and quicker execution.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed December 10, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claims 1-20, Applicants assert that the rejection of claims 1-20 is improper as US Patent Application Publication US/2002/0129097A1 by Jia is disqualified as a reference as provided by 35 U.S.C. § 103 (c), (p. 4, lines 19-

22). The Examiner disagrees because 35 U.S.C. § 103 (c) states that Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f) and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, *at the time the invention was made,* owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. At the time this invention was made, June 18, 2001, the claimed invention was not subject to an obligation of assignment. Assignment to the Hewlett-Packard Company was recorded on September 6, 2001, after the time the invention was made.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Event notification system tied to a file system. (U.S. Patent 6549916).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristina B. Honeycutt whose telephone number is 571-272-4123. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:00 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 703-308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-4124.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KBH

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER